

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended in order to more particularly point out, and distinctly claim the subject matter to which the applicants regard as their invention.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yunoi (U.S. 5,717,859) in view of Hild et al. (U.S. 6,532,368).

The present invention is a server (10) able to communicate with different appliances using different SDPs (Service Discovery Protocol) using a common database (11). The common database (11) stores service information for service attributes provided by SDP handlers (12, 13, and 14). The service information stored in the common database (11) is written in a common format that can be understood by all SDP handlers (12, 13, and 14).

Yunoki describes a multimedia communications system in which an SS7 handler (45) is provided for protocol conversion between the protocol of a common channel #7 and an ATM-SM internal protocol.

Hild et al. describes in column 4, lines 59-60 a memory for storing information about its local services. Hild et al. describes that the devices within the wireless LAN announce their own services (advertisement), and discovers the services offered by neighbor devices. Since the format of the advertisements sent from a plurality of devices is common, Applicants understand that Hild's system

is a single SDP (service discover protocol). In addition, Hild's solution combines advertisements and/or discovery with the membership.

On the other hand, a SDP server in the present invention has a common database for storing service information defined by a plurality of different and distinct service discovery protocols, written in a common format. The service information for service attributes is converted bi-directionally between different protocols by using the common database.

Applicant does not agree with description about Hild et al. cited by the Examiner. Hild's meta data protocol resource manager 11 corresponds to a single SDP. Hild et al. just proposed a single SDP. On the other hand, the present invention includes a plurality of SDP handlers to cope with a plurality of SDPs simultaneously. Furthermore, Hild et al. does not include a common database used in order to convert mutually service information.

Furthermore, Yunoki in view of Hild fails is cited as describing a common database for storing service information written in a common format. The common database in the present invention differs from a memory 16 for storing information about its local services in Hild et al.

Therefore, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the prior art relied upon by reciting,

“A service discovery protocol server for discovering a service provided by an apparatus using a service discovery protocol, from another apparatus using a service discovery protocol different from said service discovery protocol, said server comprising; a common database for storing service information defined by a plurality of different and distinct service discovery protocols, written in a common format; and a plurality of handler means for handling one of said plurality of service discovery protocols, said handler means including a conversion means for mutually converting service information between a format used in said one service discovery protocol handled in this handler means and said common format.” (Emphasis Added)

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yunoï (U.S. 5,717,859) in view of Hild et al. (U.S. 6,532,368) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-4, as amended, are believed to be patentable and in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



George N. Stevens
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,938

GNS/nrp
Atty. Docket No. 011735
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

H:\HOME\GSTEVEN\01\011735\Amendment